



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/488,909	01/21/2000	Hidcki Hiura	P4010NP/CSL	5094
58328 7590 02/08/2007 SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP FOR SUN MICROSYSTEMS P.O. BOX 061080 WACKER DRIVE STATION, SEARS TOWER CHICAGO, IL 60606-1080			EXAMINER HOANG, PHUONG N	
			ART UNIT 2194	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 02/08/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action
After the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.

09/488,909

Examiner

Phuong N. Hoang

Applicant(s)

HIURA ET AL.

Art Unit

2194

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

The reply filed 12 December 2006 is acknowledged.

1. ☐ The reply filed on or after the date of filing of an appeal brief, but prior to a final decision by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences, will not be entered because:

a. ☐ The amendment is not limited to canceling claims (where the cancellation does not affect the scope of any other pending claims) or rewriting dependent claims into independent form (no limitation of a dependent claim can be excluded in rewriting that claim). See 37 CFR 41.33(b) and (c).

b. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is not timely filed before the filing of an appeal brief.
See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(2).

2. ☐ The reply is not entered because it was not filed within the two month time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.39(b), 41.50(a)(2), or 41.50(b) (whichever is appropriate). Extensions of time under 37 CFR 1.136(a) are not available.

Note: This paragraph is for a reply filed in response to one of the following: (a) an examiner's answer that includes a new ground of rejection (37 CFR 41.39(a)(2)); (b) a supplemental examiner's answer written in response to a remand by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences for further consideration of rejection (37 CFR 41.50(a)(2)); or (c) a Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences decision that includes a new ground of rejection (37 CFR 41.50(b)).

3. ☒ The reply is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

4. ☒ Other: Applicants argued in substance that

The context address space is mapped to overlay that of another process, that does not mean that the system virtual address space is mapped to overlay another." It does not make sense to map the system virtual space of one process to another because there is only one system virtual address space. Duplicate is not the same thing as overlay.

Examiner respectfully disagrees with applicant's remark

When two address are duplicated, one can overlay another. The virtual address space and context address space is not unique. Since the virtual address space is divided into many context address spaces, and the context address references to system virtual address as part of accessing data. The virtual memory information is the virtual system address. The child would overlay the parent's virtual memory address when vm fork to duplicate a parent process's virtual memory information for a child process (col. 18 lines 28 - 55, col. 31 lines 14 - 65, col. 34 lines 10 - 15, col. 2 lines 1 - 5).


WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER